

REMARKS

This application, as amended herein, contains claims 1, 3-7, 9-11, 13-17, 19-21, 23-27, 29-31, 33-37 and 39-42. Claims 2, 8, 12, 18, 22, 28, 32 and 38 have been canceled.

Claims 1, 4, 11, 14, 21, 24, 31, 34 and 41 were rejected as anticipated by Gadol. Claims 2-10, 12-13, 15-20, 22-23, 25-30, 32-33, 35-40 and 42 were rejected as obvious over Gadol in view of Bright et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

By amendment herein, in general, the recitations of canceled claims 2, 8, 12, 18, 22, 28, 32 and 38 have been included in claims 1, 7, 11, 17, 21, 27, 31 and 37, respectively. Claim 41 has been amended in a similar manner. Thus, claims 1, 7, 11, 17, 21, 27, 31, 37 and 41 all recite at least converting a document into a program, and executing the program. For the reasons set forth below it is respectfully submitted that the claims are directed to patentable subject matter.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's interpretation of Bright et al. is simply not correct. The Examiner has cited paragraphs 0023 and 0035 of Bright et al. for the proposition that Bright et al. disclose a system for translating customer order data into a format of logical message code. From this, the examiner extrapolates to converting a document into a logic program, as set forth in the amended claims mentioned above. However, these

paragraphs of Bright et al., reproduced below, do not suggest or teach what the Examiner has stated.

Paragraph 0023 of Bright et al. states:

[0023] A third feature is that the order interceptor performs various edits and audits based upon business rules configured by customer, logical message type and message code. For example, one of the unique features of the present invention is to configure the system to hold the ESO for manual review when a predefined condition arises before posting to the application. This gives the supplier the opportunity to perform error detection and correction above those supplied by SAP AG Corporation. The ESO order interceptor also provides various user exits for customer specific requirements using the SAP Corporation SMOD and CMOD transactions. The SMOD and CMOD transactions allow enhancements to be made to the base functionality of the software. For example, additional processing steps can be added to the base functionality of the software. After the additional processing steps, the processing associated with the base functionality resumes.

Paragraph 0035 of Bright et al. states:

[0035] With reference now to the drawings, and more specifically to FIG. 2, the order interceptor system which embodies the principles of the invention is shown. The order interceptor system includes an order interceptor 201 for pre-processing ESOs before they are posted to the order processing system 209. The order interceptor 201 includes a translator 202 for translating a customer's order data into an internal format. The order data is received via a standard EDI format transmission 203. After translating the customer's order data into an internal format, the order interceptor 201 begins to process the data by customer specific business rules contained in the business rules database 210. For example, a new sales order request from a low-tiered customer can be configured for

manual service prior to posting. The same request from a high-tiered customer can be configured for manual review only under certain conditions, such as if the requestor falls under minimum order quantity levels, while the same request from another customer in the same condition could be configured for automatic routing. If the order interceptor 201 determines that an ATP check is needed, the order interceptor 201 will interface with ATP system 204 to collect the needed data from the data translator 205. The ATP system 204 serves as a planning and forecast engine that determines if a material is available for a given quantity and delivery date.

Thus Bright et al. is deficient in two respects. First, Bright et al merely teaches translating the document into an internal format, and not into a program. Second, Bright et al. provides exits for existing software modules to allow enhancements to be made to the base functionality of the existing software, and not to the document. There is no teaching or suggestion in Bright et al. of converting the document to a program, and then executing the program. In view of the above, it is submitted that claims 1, 7, 11, 17, 21, 27, 31, 37 and 41, are in fact directed to patentable subject matter.

The remaining claims depend form one of the independent claims mentioned above. These claims recite further limitations that in combination with the claim from which they depend, are not shown or suggested in the art of record.

With specific reference to claims 3, 7, 13, 23, 33, and independent claim 42, it is respectfully submitted that paragraphs 0041 to 0043 of Bright et al. do not teach or

suggest resetting any field of the document related to the cancellation request, and identifying a terminal apparatus related to the reset field to notify it. A careful reading of these paragraphs indicates that they relate to manually changing entries in document to correct errors, and not to identifying a terminal apparatus related to the reset field to notify it. It is thus respectfully submitted that dependent claims 3, 7, 13, 23, 33, and independent claim 42, are patentable over the art of record.

For the reasons set forth above, and for the reasons set forth with respect to the independent claims discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are also directed to patentable subject matter.

Applicants petition for an extension of time of three months for the filing of this paper. Please charge the fee of \$1,020 for a three-month extension of time to deposit account no. 50-0510. A duplicate of this last page is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

David Aker

David Aker, Reg. No. 29,277
23 Southern Road
Hartsdale, NY 10530
Tel. & Fax 914 674-1094

12/17/2004

Date

SERIAL NO.: 09/749,230

FILED: 12/27/2000